

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection - Stewart

The Examiner has rejected claims 33, 34, 38, 42, 45, 50 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,221 issued to Stewart (hereinafter referred to as "Stewart").

Claim 33 recites an apparatus comprising *"an interface to at least one wired client device to receive Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encrypted data and at least one wireless client device to receive Wireless Transport Layer Security (WTLS) encrypted data; client-type determining logic to determine whether a client device requesting a connection is a wired client device or a wireless client device; logic to perform a wired authentication to establish the secure connection when it is determined that the requesting client device is a wired client device; logic to perform a wireless authentication to establish the secure connection when it is determined that the requesting client device is a wireless client device; and logic to convert the SSL encrypted data to an unencrypted format and to convert the WTLS encrypted data an unencrypted format"*.

Stewart does not teach or suggest these limitations. For example, Stewart does not teach or suggest converting SSL and WTLS data to unencrypted formats. As shown in FIG. 1C of Stewart, a centralized network 130 preferably the Internet (see column 8, line 65) is disposed between the hybrid wired and wireless access point 124 and service provider 140. Applicants respectfully submit that Stewart would not convert encrypted

data to unencrypted format in the hybrid wired and wireless access point 124, since this would compromise the end-to-end security for a transaction between the portable computing devices 110A/B and the service provider 140.

Accordingly, claim 33 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart. Independent claims 50 and 56, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable for one or more similar reasons in that Stewart does not teach or suggest security format conversions in hybrid wired and wireless access point 124.

Claim 42 recites a method comprising *"receiving data within a data center from at least one wired client device and at least one wireless client device each requesting a secure connection with a server of the data center; performing a wired authentication to establish the secure connection with the wired client device; and performing a wireless authentication to establish the secure connection with the wireless client device"*.

Stewart does not teach or suggest these limitations. For example, Stewart does not teach or suggest receiving data within a data center from at least one wired client device and at least one wireless client device each requesting a secure connection with a server of the data center. As clearly shown in FIG. 1C of Stewart, the access point 124 is not within the data center of the service provider 140, but rather they are separated by the network 130 which is reportedly preferably the Internet.

Accordingly, claim 42 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Stewart.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart and Gast

The Examiner has rejected claims 35, 36, 40, 43, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046532 issued to Gast (hereinafter "Gast").

As discussed above, Stewart does not teach or suggest one or more limitations of each of the independent claims. Gast does not remedy what is missing from Stewart. Accordingly, the independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Gast. Applicants furthermore do not admit that Stewart and Gast should be combined and elect at this time not to address other aspects of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart and Douglas

The Examiner has rejected claims 35, 36, 40, 43, 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0010684 issued to Douglas (hereinafter "Douglas").

As discussed above, Stewart does not teach or suggest one or more limitations of each of the independent claims. Douglas does not remedy what is missing from Stewart. Accordingly, the independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Douglas. Applicants furthermore do not admit that Stewart and Douglas should be combined and elect at this time not to address other aspects of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Stewart and Hajmiragha

The Examiner has rejected claims 39 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,460 issued to Hajmiragha (hereinafter "Hajmiragha").

As discussed above, Stewart does not teach or suggest one or more limitations of each of the independent claims. Hajmiragha does not remedy what is missing from Stewart. Accordingly, the independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over Stewart and Hajmiragha. Applicants furthermore do not admit that Stewart and Hajmiragha should be combined and elect at this time not to address other aspects of the rejection.

Atty Docket No. 42P12318X
Application No. 10/045,893

12

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/24/06

Brent E. Vecchia
Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030

Atty Docket No. 42P12318X
Application No. 10/045,893

13